



ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

MISSOURI PART C 2010-11



Submitted January 27, 2012
Office of Special Education

Table of Contents

Introduction to the Annual Performance Report:	3
Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.	5
Indicator 2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.	10
Indicator 3: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:.....	12
A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);	
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and	
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.	
Indicator 4: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:	17
A. Know their rights;	
B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and	
C. Help their children develop and learn.	
Indicator 5: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.	21
Indicator 6: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.	23
Indicator 7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.....	24
Indicator 8: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:	27
A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;	
B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and	
C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.	
Indicator 9: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.	32
Indicator 10: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.....	37
Indicator 11: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.	39
Indicator 12: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).	40
Indicator 13: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.	41
Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.	42

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010-11

Introduction to the Annual Performance Report:

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (the Department) is the lead State agency for Part C of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Missouri's early intervention program, First Steps, is operated through contractual agreements in ten regions across the State and a contracted Central Finance Office (CFO). The ten regional offices are known as System Points of Entry (SPOE) and they provide service coordination, evaluation and eligibility determination, as well as all local administrative activities for the program. The State contracts with a single entity in each region to fulfill the SPOE function. Independent providers enroll with the CFO and provide direct services to children and families as directed by the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP).

This Annual Performance Report (APR) covers federal fiscal year 2010 which is the State fiscal year 2011 (July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011). The time period covered by this report is referred to as "2010-2011" to eliminate confusion due to the differing State and federal fiscal year terminology.

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

This APR was developed with review and input from the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and the SPOEs, as was the State Performance Plan (SPP). On December 30, 2011, the SPOE contractors and the SICC received a draft of the SPP/APR documents. These groups were asked to provide feedback to the Department so that recommendations could be considered and incorporated into the final document prior to the scheduled review of the final draft at the January 13, 2012 SICC meeting. At this meeting, the SICC approved the report and accepted it as their annual report. The SICC Certification of the APR is available at <http://dese.mo.gov/se/SPPpage.html>.

Public Dissemination and Reporting: Missouri's SPP and APR are available for public viewing on the Department website at <http://dese.mo.gov/se/SPPpage.html>. This webpage also provides a link to the public reporting by SPOE. These forms of reporting allow the public to review the State's SPP targets and be aware of any progress/slippage at the State and local levels.

In addition to the annual reporting of the APR, the Office of Special Education reports annually to the regional SPOE offices and the SICC on progress/slippage made across the State during the previous year on meeting the State's targets as addressed in the SPP. During these discussions, indicators are examined and evaluated related to the Improvement Activities described in the SPP. Data are tracked and reviewed periodically during the year to identify current trends that may require immediate technical assistance to individual regions within the State. The SICC certifies this APR report as their annual report to the Governor and the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education.

Monitoring Procedures: The ten SPOEs are divided into two sets of five for monitoring purposes. Each set of five SPOEs is representative of the State as a whole, since urban and rural areas are included in each cohort and the child count is similar. Each set of SPOEs receives a compliance review every other year.

In 2010-11, monitoring data were obtained through compliance monitoring procedures, which involved desk reviews of individual child records, SPOE staff interviews and/or onsite reviews. For each Service Coordinator in each of the five SPOE regions, two randomly selected files for children active in fiscal year 2010-11 were reviewed. The number of Service Coordinators included in the review ranged from five in the smallest rural SPOE to 15 in the largest urban SPOE.

Consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, the State ensures that each SPOE agency with noncompliance identified from any source: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieve 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE.

Corrective Action Plans are required for all identified noncompliance and all noncompliance must be corrected within 12 months of the SPOE agency's notification of the findings. State staff request additional data as part of the follow-up review. These data must indicate 100% correction of noncompliance and SPOEs may only receive a report of correction of noncompliance when all correction is verified.

All findings of individual child noncompliance are expected to be corrected at 100% within 60 days, but must be corrected within 12 months from the date of notification of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer under the jurisdiction of the program. State staff request documentation showing that the individual noncompliance has been corrected and any other required actions (such as compensatory services, evaluations completed, etc) have been put in place.

Timely correction of noncompliance is ensured through the use of the web-based monitoring system, Improvement Monitoring Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) and frequent contact with the SPOEs by Area Directors and other State staff. SPOEs are informed through various communications about enforcement actions that may be taken for failure to correct noncompliance within 12 months. Any SPOE agency not willing or able to correct noncompliance within 12 months of receiving notification (timely correction) is considered out of compliance and is subject to the enforcement actions as indicated in their contractual agreement.

Evaluation of SPP Improvement Activities: The Office of Special Education began work with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) in November 2007 to develop a plan for evaluating the implementation and impact of all SPP Improvement Activities. The NCRRC trained Office of Special Education staff in a model for evaluating Improvement Activities. Using this model, Office of Special Education staff have continued to review and revise existing Improvement Activities, align those activities with relevant contractual activities, and develop action plans with implementation and impact measures for those activities. Revisions to the Improvement Activities are reflected in the SPP/APR. The Office of Special Education will continue to collaborate with the NCRRC and work on the evaluation of Improvement Activities in 2011-12.

Regional Technical Assistance: The Department employs five Area Directors to work as a program unit within the field. Each Area Director provides direction, training and problem solving for two contiguous SPOE regions. The Area Directors also function as the statewide technical assistance resource for the program which enables the lead agency to provide a consistent message to the early intervention community. The Area Directors are supervised by the coordinator of the First Steps Program, who is employed by the Department.

Transdisciplinary Teams: The Area Directors are an integral part of the movement toward Early Intervention Teams, Missouri's service delivery model that involves transdisciplinary teams and a primary provider model. In 2010-11, SPOEs met their contractual requirement to implement the team model for at least 25 percent of new families. In 2011-12 the SPOE contractual requirements indicate assignment to teams will increase to at least 50 percent of new families. The Area Directors provide initial guidance and instruction to regional SPOE offices and providers and will provide continued mentoring to teams as Missouri achieves statewide implementation.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010-11

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010-11	100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner

Actual Target Data for 2010-11:

At 91.5%, Missouri did not meet the 100% target for this indicator.

Infants and Toddlers with IFSPs who receive Early Intervention Services in a Timely Manner:
(includes data for initial services from the entire fiscal year)

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner (within 30 days of parent consent)	N/A	1,383	1,321	46	61
Infants and toddlers receiving all IFSP services with acceptable reasons for delay in initiation of services*	N/A	266	424	17	14
Subtotal - Number of infants and toddlers receiving all IFSP services within 30 days or with acceptable reasons*	2,416	1,649	1,745	63	75
Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	2,964	1,834	1,931	72	82
Percent of infants and toddler with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner*	81.5%	89.9%	90.4%	87.5%	91.5%

* Both the infants and toddlers receiving all services within 30 days (numerator) and the total infants and toddlers receiving IFSP services (denominator) include children whose delays in initiation of services were due to exceptional family circumstances.

Data reported for 2006-07 included all children in the State.

Data reported for 2007-08 and 2008-09 included all children in five of the ten SPOEs in the State.

Data reported for 2009-10 and 2010-11 are based on a review of selected files from five of the ten SPOEs in the State. (See Overview under "Monitoring Procedures" for selection procedures).

In Missouri, services for infants and toddlers with IFSPs must begin within 30 days of parental consent to be considered timely. Timely services are determined by comparing the date of parental consent for the service to the first date the service is provided for each service type.

Missouri's web-based child data and IFSP system (WebSPOE) prompts Service Coordinators to enter the reason for delay if a child's initial service or any subsequent new service was provided more than 30 days after the date of parental consent. The delay may be due to acceptable or unacceptable reasons.

Acceptable reasons for untimely services include: Authorization/Billing Issue, Parent/Child Delay, and Team Decision. An Authorization/Billing issue indicates that the service actually did begin within 30 days, but an issue with the entry of an authorization or the provider's billing for the service made it appear as though the service did not start within 30 days. A Parent/Child Delay indicates exceptional family circumstances (e.g., child illness/hospitalization, family vacation, and unable to locate family). A Team Decision indicates the IFSP Team decided the initiation of services should not commence within the first 30 days after the team meeting.

Unacceptable reasons for untimely services include: Provider Delay, Service Coordinator Delay, and No Provider Available. A Provider Delay indicates the provider was the reason for the service not being provided within 30 days of parental consent. A Service Coordinator Delay indicates the Service Coordinator was the reason for the service not being provided within 30 days of parental consent. A No Provider Available indicates no provider could be located to provide a service.

In 2010-11, records of 83 children were reviewed for timely services and a total of 21 children had delayed services. Of the 21 children with delayed services, 14 had acceptable reasons and seven had unacceptable reasons. When one or more services on the child's IFSP were untimely due to an unacceptable delay, the child was included under **Unacceptable Reasons for Untimely Services** in the table below.

The table below shows the distribution of reasons for untimely services.

Acceptable Reasons for Untimely Services	
Reason for delay	Number
Authorization/Billing Issue (no actual delay in provision of services)	1
Parent/Child Delay (exceptional family circumstances)	11
Team Decision	2
Total	14
Unacceptable Reasons for Untimely Services	
Reason for delay	Number
Provider Delay	6
Service Coordinator Delay	1
No Provider Available	0
Total	7

Records of the 83 children indicated a total of 164 initial services were delivered during 2010-11. Of the 164 initial services, 157 (95.7%) were provided in a timely manner or there were acceptable reasons for initiating the services beyond 30 days. Of the seven initial services with an unacceptable reason, the actual delays in initiation of services ranged from 2 to 33 days beyond the 30 day threshold. The seven unacceptable reasons were from several different SPOE regions and service types thus no pattern was seen in the untimely provision of services.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010-11:

The State did not meet the target of 100% compliance; however, improvement from the previous year is reported. While the State is moving toward a transdisciplinary team approach to service delivery with dedicated teams of providers to serve designated geographical regions, much of 2010-11 was spent in

the initial implementation stage where teams provided services to approximately 25 percent of new families. Continued implementation of dedicated teams should improve the availability of providers, thus improving the State's performance on delivery of services in a timely manner.

Improvement Activities for 2010-11 include the following:

- Provide training and technical assistance to Service Coordinators and providers on initiating timely IFSP services through a Transdisciplinary Team Approach.
- Provide materials for Service Coordinators and providers to clarify policies/procedures related to initiation of services after initial IFSP decisions.

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Transdisciplinary Team Approach: Missouri is moving toward a statewide transdisciplinary model of service delivery, Early Intervention Teams (EIT), which includes the use of a Routines-Based Interview™ and a primary provider approach to service delivery. Much of fiscal year 2011 was spent on initial implementation of the model. As indicated in the SPOE contracts awarded in fiscal year 2009 and implemented July 1, 2009, SPOE agencies were to begin to implement teams in each SPOE region as of July 1, 2010. Each SPOE agency met their contract requirement of at least 25 percent of new families assigned to teams in fiscal year 2011. The contract stipulates the SPOE agency will assign at least 50 percent of new families to teams in fiscal year 2012.

With the assistance of National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC) and Dr. Robin McWilliam, the State is in the process of developing five levels of training for providers who participate on teams. Two of the five trainings were disseminated in fiscal year 2010 and two were disseminated in fiscal year 2011. The final level of training will be disseminated in fiscal year 2012. The First Steps Area Directors continue to support the development and training of teams across the State.

Review/Revise Materials: The First Steps WebSPOE system provides a systematic way to capture whether delays in the initiation of service were timely. Reasons available for selection include 1) parent/child reason for delay), 2) Service Coordinator reason for delay), 3) team decision to delay services, 4) provider delay and 5) authorization/billing issue. In February 2011, the WebSPOE system was updated with an enhanced organization and new design to the entire site, which included an update in the reasons for any delay in timely services.

The First Steps Area Directors reviewed written guidance on timely services that outlined the definitions of the five reasons for delay and how Service Coordinators would enter reasons for untimely services. A Provider Service Request Form was developed for statewide use to help Service Coordinators and providers keep track of evaluation and service deadlines. The lead agency is modifying the web system to include an electronic copy of this request form, which will be available in fiscal year 2012. The First Steps Area Directors continue to provide technical assistance regarding the provision of services in a timely manner.

Correction of previous noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance: As previously reported in the FFY09 APR, no findings of noncompliance were originally issued for this indicator in 2009-10 because prior to issuance of findings, State staff confirmed that all children for whom services were delayed were receiving the services authorized by the IFSP although late. Per OSEP instructions in the FFY09 response table, "the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction".

In response to OSEP's request, in the fall of 2011, the State did a desk review of updated data from each of the five SPOEs monitored for this indicator in 2009-10. Five files were randomly selected from each of the five SPOEs to verify that all noncompliance had been corrected at 100%. During the desk review,

continued noncompliance was identified in four of the five SPOEs with each SPOE having one instance of noncompliance. Two additional files were reviewed for each instance of noncompliance, resulting in 100% correction. All files with identified noncompliance were for children who were no longer in the First Steps program; therefore, no individual child corrective actions were issued. As a result of the verification process, the State confirmed that these five SPOEs had corrected all noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance: As previously reported in the FFY08 APR, no findings of noncompliance were originally issued for this indicator in 2008-09 because prior to issuance of findings, State staff confirmed that all children for whom services were delayed were receiving the services authorized by the IFSP although late. Per OSEP instructions in the FFY09 response table, “the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction”.

In response to OSEP’s request, in the fall of 2011, the State did a desk review of updated data from each of the five SPOEs monitored for this indicator in 2008-09. Five files were randomly selected from each of the five SPOEs to verify that all noncompliance had been corrected at 100%. All files were found to be in compliance. As a result of the verification process, the State confirmed that these five SPOEs had corrected all noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable)

N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010-11:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2009 (2009-10) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the State is in compliance with the timely service provision requirements in 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.

For noncompliance the State attempted to verify as corrected prior to issuing findings, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the uncorrected noncompliance was verified as corrected consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Department Response: The State has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the sections above entitled “Correction of Previous Noncompliance.” The State was able to verify that all EIS programs with identified noncompliance (1) were correctly implementing 34 CFR

§§303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a desk review of updated data; and (2) initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010-11

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010-11	95.0% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children

Actual Target Data for 2010-11:

Missouri exceeded the 2010-11 target for this indicator with 98.9% of children served in the home or programs for typically developing children.

Primary Setting for children under 3 years of age with active IFSPs*	12/1/2008	%	12/1/2009	%	12/1/2010	%
Home	3,506	92.7%	3,923	93.4%	4,305	94.8%
Community-based Setting	204	5.4%	200	4.8%	186	4.1%
Total	3,710	98.0%	4,123	98.2%	4,491	98.9%
Program Designed for Children with Developmental Delay or Disabilities	49	1.3%	64	1.5%	43	1.0%
Service Provider Location	9	0.2%	3	0.1%	1	0.0%
Hospital (Inpatient)	8	0.2%	4	0.1%	4	0.1%
Other Setting	5	0.1%	5	0.1%	0	0.0%
Residential Facility	3	0.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total Other	74	2.0%	77	1.8%	48	1.1%
Total	3,784	100.0%	4,200	100.0%	4,539	100.0%

*Data based on 618 Table 2

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010-11:

Primary setting data in Missouri continue to show a very high percentage of children served in their natural environment. The data are supported by results of monitoring reviews which confirm that the decision-making process regarding service settings is appropriate and in compliance with regulatory requirements.

Improvement Activities for 2010-11 included the following:

- Provide targeted technical assistance to SPOEs identified through evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve/maintain performance on this indicator.
- Implement IFSP Quality Indicators Rating Scale (QIRS) to assess IFSP quality.

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Targeted Technical Assistance: Data reports are posted monthly to the Department's website. Data on primary setting for direct services are reviewed by the First Steps Area Directors on a monthly basis, with the vast majority of the services being provided in the natural environments throughout 2010-11. In specific cases where the SPOE region reports a high number of hospital or special purpose center as the primary setting or a primary setting is identified as "other," the Area Director for that SPOE region would provide technical assistance and further clarification on primary settings based on previous guidance on natural environments.

IFSP Quality Indicators Rating Scale: The IFSP QIRS process was developed by lead agency staff, in conjunction with nationally recognized early childhood experts, to provide a "quality" evaluation instrument used to evaluate IFSPs. In order to ensure that IFSP teams are making individualized decisions regarding the settings in which infants and toddlers receive early intervention services, the Area Directors conduct a QIRS scoring process that includes the review of any natural environment justification statements in the event that services are provided outside of the natural environment.

The SPOE contracts require that the region receive an overall score on the QIRS review in the "acceptable" to "high quality" range or liquidated damages will be applied to the next year's contract. For the 2010-11, each of the SPOE regions reviewed received ratings at the acceptable or quality level; therefore, no penalty was applied to the contract renewal for the 2010-11 fiscal year based on the QIRS review.

The Area Directors review the QIRS results with each SPOE agency and hold training activities targeted to continue strengthening the quality of IFSP development. These efforts are intended to ensure that all children and families receive high quality intervention services through the First Steps program.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010-11:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2009 (2009-10) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010-11

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 3: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement: Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = $[\# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)} \div [\# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus } \# \text{ of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d)}] \times 100$.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age

expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus [# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e) divided by the total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
2010-2011	Outcome Areas	A: Positive social-emotional skills	B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs
	Summary Statement 1	69.2%	70.4%	73.1%
	Summary Statement 2	47.5%	45.6%	36.2%

Actual Target Data for 2010-11:

Outcome Areas	A: Positive social-emotional skills		B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills		C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	
	# children	% children	# children	% children	# children	% children
a. Did not improve functioning	48	3.9%	43	3.5%	49	4.0%
b. Improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	318	25.9%	314	25.6%	313	25.5%
c. Improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers	357	29.1%	357	29.1%	465	37.9%
d. Improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	233	19.0%	272	22.2%	236	19.2%
e. Maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	270	22.0%	240	19.6%	163	13.3%
Total	1,226	100.0%	1,226	100.0%	1,226	100.0%

Summary Statements:

Outcome Areas	A: Positive social-emotional skills	B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs
	% children	% children	% children
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome, the percent that substantially increased their rate of growth in the Outcome by the time they exited	61.7%	63.8%	65.9%
2. Percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in	41.0%	41.8%	32.5%

Outcome by the time they exited			
---------------------------------	--	--	--

Definition of “comparable to same-aged peers”: Based on the ratings determined at entry and exit by the First Steps personnel, “comparable to same-aged peers” is defined as a rating of “5” on a scale of 1-5, meaning “completely (all of the time/typical)” in response to the question “To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations?” A rating of “5” roughly translates to a 0-10% delay.

Instruments and Procedures for Assessment and Data Reporting of Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO):

- Each eligible child entering First Steps or Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) must have an ECO rating if the child has the potential of being in the program at least six months
- First Steps and ECSE must use three sources of information rather than a single approved assessment instrument. The three sources of information are parent input, professional observation and assessment results. While First Steps personnel are not required to use a specific assessment instrument, personnel determine the appropriate tool(s) to collect assessment results for this indicator. No approved list of instruments has been compiled at this time. In 2011-12 a review of available instruments for collecting First Steps entry and exit data will be completed and if appropriate, a pilot of selected instrument(s) may be implemented in one or more SPOE regions
- In order to synthesize the three sources of information into a comprehensive summary, the State provides the Missouri Outcomes Summary Sheet (MOSS) form, which is designed specifically to address information relevant to Indicator 3 on the Part C APR. This form is currently used by all local programs and can be viewed at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/ECOtraining.html>. The MOSS is used to provide standard documentation Statewide for reporting to the Department
- Entry and exit data are recorded on the MOSS within 30 days of eligibility determination and exit from the program, respectively
- A rating between 1-5 is determined for each of the three outcome indicators with 1 meaning “Not Yet” and 5 meaning “Completely”
- Beginning in February 2011, all First Steps entry and exit data are entered into the electronic child record system known as WebSPOE and the State analyzes the data at the end of that year
- The outcome status for each child is determined by comparing the entry and exit ratings

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010-11:

Missouri did not meet targets for Summary Statement 1 or 2 for any of the three outcome areas. In 2010-11, State staff attended multiple Part B/Part C partnership meetings throughout the state and found discrepancies in the data collection procedures. Staff found that First Steps personnel were reporting data primarily via parent input while ECSE personnel were reporting data primarily via assessment results. The State then modified the data collection procedures for ECO so that all First Steps and ECSE ratings must include three sources of information: parent input, professional observation and assessment results. As a result of this modification, ratings became more collaborative between First Steps and ECSE, which impacted Summary Statements 1 and 2.

A further analysis of the data for this indicator found an increased number of children who entered the program at a young age (see Indicator 5) with medical or newborn conditions. The children initially had unknown developmental delays and later were identified with delays thus influencing their exit ratings which impacted Summary Statement 1.

Due to the population being served in First Steps, most children continue to be eligible and receive services in Part B, ECSE. Data from the Part B program show that children receiving services in ECSE continue to grow and make progress on these outcomes. (See Part B APR, Indicator 7).

Improvement Activities for 2010-11 included the following:

- Provide ECO training through periodic face-to-face and online trainings to improve administration of the ECO assessment and data collection and reporting for Early Childhood Outcomes

- Evaluate First Steps and ECSE ECO data through the use of common identification numbers using the Missouri Student Information System (MOSIS) on an annual basis to ensure the reliability and validity of the data
- Provide targeted technical assistance to agencies identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting State targets based on evaluation of data provided by the Department in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Provide Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Training: All ECO training materials, including a video presentation, handouts and resources are posted on the Office of Special Education website at <http://dese.mo.gov/divspered/ECOtraining.html>. Beginning in February 2011, the First Steps entry and exit data were added as an enhancement to the WebSPOE system. Statewide trainings on the new system were held in February 2011 and included a review of ECO data collection and reporting. Service Coordinators began entering ECO data in the WebSPOE system in March 2011.

ECSE personnel and SPOE administrators receive regular reminders through Listserv messages regarding the availability of the materials and the importance of training for staff who will be administering the assessment and the timely and accurate reporting of the data. In order to improve collaboration between First Steps and ECSE personnel in the area of determining a rating and collecting data, a webinar was held in June 2011 with participants from both First Steps and ECSE attending. Training regarding ECO data collection and reporting will continue in 2011-12.

Evaluate First Steps and ECSE ECO Data: In 2010-11, the State implemented a data collection process that required at least three sources of information for every First Steps and ECSE entry and exit rating (i.e., professional input, parent report and assessment results) regardless of the instrument used. In November 2010, a Statewide meeting of SPOE Directors included a discussion of ECO data collection regarding what constitutes a functional outcome that is meaningful across multiple settings and times of the day. Discussions indicated that improvements in collaboration and coordination with ECSE have helped to provide consistency between First Steps entry and ECSE exit ratings.

State staff performed cross checks to analyze whether improvements were made in using First Steps exit ratings for ECSE entry ratings. Upon analysis, the number of children for whom the First Steps exit ratings were used for ECSE entry ratings has increased more than 80% since 2008–09. This increase was evident in regions across the state.

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance: In 2010-11, the process for recording and collecting regional data changed from a manual process of collecting data on spreadsheets to an electronic process of recording the data in the child's record in WebSPOE. The Area Directors provided technical assistance on ECO by attending staff meetings, fielding questions, and conducting regional trainings, as needed. An example of targeted technical assistance in 2010-11 occurred when the Area Directors assisted in compiling the Statewide data and a region was found to have a high number of children without exit ratings. Upon review it was determined that this region had a high number of late referrals where the children did not participate in early intervention at least six months in order to obtain an exit rating. Technical assistance regarding the determination of ECO ratings and the data collection process will continue in 2011-12.

Provide Information on Evidence Based Practices and Strategies: Missouri's ECO website includes training materials for best practice related to assessing young children. The materials were developed using information provided by the National ECO Center so that Missouri accurately measures the performance of infants, toddlers and preschoolers with disabilities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010-11:

One Improvement Activity has been discontinued in the State Performance Plan. This change was made as a result of an evaluation process that identified duplicative efforts within multiple Improvement Activities. This change was presented to and approved by the SICC in January 2012.

MO FFY 2009 (2009-10) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR.

Department Response: The State has reported progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 in this APR.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010-11

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 4: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010-11	4A, 4B, 4C: 95% of parents will agree or strongly agree with the survey items

Actual Target Data for 2010-11:

The State met the 2010-11 targets for indicators 4A, 4B and 4C, with family survey data indicating 96.8%, 97.2% and 97.7% agreement, respectively.

Survey Instrument: The complete family survey can be found at <http://dese.mo.gov/se/fs/documents/2011CFOSurvey.pdf>.

Survey Methodology: As noted in previous Annual Performance Reports, the Department worked with the University of Missouri Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSEDA) to evaluate the representativeness and reliability of the First Steps Family Survey. As a result of this collaboration, changes to the 2007 survey included the addition of new items designed to meet the reporting requirements for this APR and to enhance subsequent analysis of survey data. In addition, a split survey methodology was used in 2007 to explore the use of sampling versus a census approach to gathering yearly data.

Several conclusions were drawn from analyzing the 2007 data from the split survey design:

- The two methods resulted in very similar rates of agreement
- No non-response bias was evident by using the census methodology
- Response rates by SPOE region did not differ between the two methodologies
- Survey results were representative of the State as a whole
- Either method (census or sample) is appropriate and produces valid and reliable data that adequately represent the population of the First Steps program.

For 2010-11, the census methodology was utilized and surveys were mailed to all families receiving First Steps services. The response rate for 2010-2011 was 22.8% which was a slight decrease from previous years. For results from previous years, see: <http://dese.mo.gov/se/fs/data.html#OtherReports>. An analysis of responses by SPOE indicates that response rates are comparable across the State.

Family Survey Data

A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights

Q10. I received information and explanations about our family's rights to file a child complaint.

	Family Survey 2009	Family Survey 2010	Family Survey 2011		
Strongly Agree	92.4%	94.1%	583	59.3%	95.1%*
Agree			352	35.8%	
Disagree	7.6%	5.9%	38	3.9%	4.9%
Strongly Disagree			10	1.0%	

Q11. I received information and explanations about our family's parental rights.

	Family Survey 2009	Family Survey 2010	Family Survey 2011		
Strongly Agree	96.9%	98.1%	634	62.3%	98.4%*
Agree			367	36.1%	
Disagree	3.1%	1.9%	12	1.2%	1.6%
Strongly Disagree			4	0.4%	

***Average affirmative response for questions related to Indicator 4A: Average of 95.1% and 98.4% = 96.8%**

B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs

Q24. Since being part of First Steps, I can work with professionals.

	Family Survey 2009	Family Survey 2010	Family Survey 2011		
Strongly Agree	96.8%	98.1%	542	60.3%	98.1%*
Agree			340	37.8%	
Disagree	3.2%	1.9%	10	1.1%	1.9%
Strongly Disagree			7	0.8%	

Q25. Since being part of First Steps, I know how to advocate for what my child needs.

	Family Survey 2009	Family Survey 2010	Family Survey 2011		
Strongly Agree	94.4%	97.2%	573	60.6%	96.3%*
Agree			338	35.7%	
Disagree	5.6%	2.8%	25	2.7%	3.7%
Strongly Disagree			9	1.0%	

***Average affirmative response for questions related to Indicator 4B: Average of 98.1% and 96.3% = 97.2%**

C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn

Q19. First Steps services give my family the tools to directly improve my child's development.

	Family Survey 2009	Family Survey 2010	Family Survey 2011		
Strongly Agree	97.4%	98.5%	670	65.7%	97.7%*
Agree			326	32.0%	
Disagree	2.6%	1.5%	19	1.9%	2.3%
Strongly Disagree			4	0.4%	

***Affirmative response for question related to Indicator 4C: 97.7%**

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010-11:

The State met the 2010-11 targets for indicators 4A, 4B and 4C, with family survey data indicating 96.8%, 97.2% and 97.7% agreement, respectively. This high performance may be attributed to technical assistance and training of Service Coordinators regarding the provision and explanation of the Parental Rights Statement to First Steps families.

Improvement Activities for 2010-11 included the following:

- Support Missouri Parent Training and Information Center (MPACT) to provide training, resources and materials regarding parent/family involvement to families.
- Plan for the development of a First Steps family mentor program.
- Provide training and technical assistance to Service Coordinators based on results of First Steps family survey.

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Provide Training, Resources and Materials to Families: MPACT was contracted to develop the *Steps to Success* training series in 2010-11. The series provides information to families on how to work effectively with teams, understand the early intervention process and understand their rights. The series also provides professionals with an understanding of the First Steps program. The following modules are included in the series: Understanding the IFSP Process, Communicating Effectively with Your IFSP Team, First Steps Parental Rights, and Transition from C to B. Implementation of the series in 2010-11 included dissemination to MPACT staff and MPACT Parent Mentors to ensure their understanding of the First Steps program.

During 2010-11, trainings from the *Steps for Success* series were conducted for parents and agency personnel (including First Steps, Head Start, ECSE and MPACT staff) in locations across the state. The training schedule included the following:

- Four *Steps to Success -Understanding the IFSP Process* trainings
- Three *Steps to Success - First Steps Parental Rights* trainings
- Two *Steps to Success - Communicating Effectively* trainings
- Two *Steps to Success – Transition Part C to B* trainings

Approximately 148 families and professionals were trained on the series during 2010-11. Of the 148 trained, 91 training evaluations were collected. Data collected from those evaluations indicate that 90 of the 91 participants agreed or strongly agreed that the training was of high quality, presented relevant information, and that they planned to use the information for their child's education or would share the information with other families in order to improve educational practice. Additional regional training for families and professionals is planned for 2011-12.

Each year MPACT analyzes family survey data, focusing on a small number of key questions to develop topics for the parent newsletters. In addition to the family survey results, the topics for parent newsletters may be determined by a review of program data and content selected by the local programs or lead agency. The newsletters are disseminated to all families receiving First Steps services. In 2010-11 the topics addressed in parent newsletters included Timely Services, Annual Family Survey Results, Oral Care for Infants and Toddlers and Family Cost Participation. The information gathered from an analysis of the 2010-11 family survey results will become topics for the 2011-12 newsletters.

In 2010-11, additional materials for families were developed in response to parent need, as evidenced through an analysis of the annual family survey data. MPACT developed three Parent Fact Sheets which include information on Eligibility Criteria, Early Intervention Services and Parental Rights.

In support of the activities conducted by MPACT, the lead agency developed Transition C to B packets which are disseminated during early childhood resource fairs and one-on-one parent assistance to families whose children would be transitioning from Part C to Part B. The packets include a parent handbook, developed in collaboration between MPACT and the lead agency, which covers basic information on the transition process; and a video depicting a transition meeting with participation by early childhood programs. During 2010-11, Service Coordinators provided the Transition C to B packets to

families as they began discussions about transition from First Steps. Dissemination of the packets will continue in 2011-12. A review of the materials in the packets is planned for 2011-12 and revisions will be made as needed.

Family Mentor System: During 2010-11, the SICC discussed family leadership and network of support as it relates to a family mentor system. Members of the council presented options for developing parent leadership through existing infrastructures such as other agency systems and regional councils. Members also shared ideas for creating an ad hoc committee for parents and alternate representatives for parent members on the council. Discussions about parent leadership and family mentors will continue in 2011-12.

Service Coordinator Trainings: The lead agency conducts quarterly SPOE Director meetings and/or trainings as a way to ensure guidance is disseminated and current practice is in place. In addition to the lead agency trainings, monthly staff meetings between SPOE Directors and Service Coordinators occur in most regions and consist of reminders or updates to policies and procedures. SPOE Director meetings and Service Coordinator trainings conducted by the lead agency in 2010-11 consisted of the following topics: Notice of Action/Consent, Transition C to B, Early Childhood Outcomes, Compliance Monitoring Procedures and Early Intervention Teams. SPOE Director meetings will continue to be held on a quarterly basis and trainings with Service Coordinators will occur on an as needed basis in 2011-12.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010-11:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2009 (2009-10) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010-11

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 5: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared national data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010-11	0.85% of infants and toddlers birth to 1 will have IFSPs

Actual Target Data for 2010-11:

With 0.92% of children birth to age 1 served by Missouri's First Steps program, the State met the 2010-11 target.

Percent of Children Birth to Age 1 with IFSPs

	Dec-06	Dec-07	Dec-08	Dec-09	Dec-10
Child Count	500	617	616	676	703
Estimated Population*	78,424	80,673	82,359	80,605	76,119
Missouri %	0.64%	0.76%	0.75%	0.84%	0.92%
National %		1.01%	1.04%	1.03%	1.03%

* Estimated Population from US Bureau of Census

Source: Data from 618, Table C-13 at <https://www.ideadata.org/PopulationData.asp#2010>

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010-11:

While the estimated population decreased by 5.6%, the number of children birth to age 1 increased by 4.0% and Missouri met the target for 2010-11.

Improvement Activities for 2010-11 included the following:

- Provide information and/or resources to primary referral sources in order to improve child find procedures, reduce inappropriate referrals, and target underserved populations.

Discussion of the Improvement Activity follows:

Provide Information/Resources to Primary Referral Sources: First Steps SPOE Directors and Area Directors participated in various State and local early childhood conferences to share referral information. Conference attendees received information regarding the First Steps program including eligibility requirements and referral procedures.

In 2010-11, the lead agency developed and disseminated brochures on early intervention services to targeted referral sources in the medical community. Each Regional Interagency Coordinating Council (RICC) also reported collaboration with local community hospitals and physician's offices as well as Head Start offices, Parents as Teachers (PAT), the Department of Mental Health and local early childhood programs. Specific activities included the distribution of printed materials, developing community resource lists and attending early childhood and health fairs.

In order to support local efforts in providing collaborative high quality services to families of children with disabilities birth to five years in the areas of identification, evaluation, IFSP/IEP development, training, transition and inclusion, the lead agency has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Early Head Start/Head Start. Additionally, lead agency staff participates in the Missouri Head Start advisory council and Missouri's SpecialQuest Birth-5 Initiative.

In 2010-11, the First Steps Area Directors and SPOE Directors assisted the PAT National Center, located in St. Louis, Missouri, with facilitating First Steps presentations at special needs training and in-services for PAT educators. At these presentations, information was shared regarding the First Steps program, including IDEA, eligibility criteria, facilitating appropriate referrals and referral procedures. Throughout 2010-11, the lead agency discussed appropriate screening procedures with SPOE Directors and Service Coordinators in order to coordinate with PAT efforts to identify children with developmental delays or disabilities.

Current data indicate the number of referrals has increased overall with the largest relative increases in parent referrals and referrals from the medical community (i.e., hospitals, NICU, physicians). However, a noticeable decrease in referrals in 2010-11 came from the Parents as Teachers program. A continuing area of concern for the State is that approximately half of all referrals do not result in an IFSP, due to ineligibility, parent withdrawal prior to IFSP development or the inability to contact the family after the initial referral is made. Missouri's narrow eligibility criteria may be part of the reason for this high percentage of ineligible children. There continues to be a need to educate primary referral sources about the program's criteria.

In 2010-11, enhancements were made to the WebSPOE system that included a revision to the online referral entry system. The lead agency provided referral procedures to targeted hospitals with a NICU as well as health care professionals who are actively enrolled as First Steps providers.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010-11:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2009 (2009-10) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010-11

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 6: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to national data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010-11	1.67% of infants and toddlers birth to 3 will have IFSPs

Actual Target Data for 2010-11:

At 1.96% of children birth to age 3 served by Missouri's First Steps program, the State met the 2010-11 target.

Percent of Children Birth to Age 3 with IFSPs

	Dec-06	Dec-07	Dec-08	Dec-09	Dec-10
Child Count	3,216	3,450	3,784	4,200	4,539
Estimated Population*	234,751	238,086	243,847	244,769	231,982
Missouri %	1.37%	1.45%	1.55%	1.72%	1.96%
National %		2.48%	2.66%	2.67%	2.82%

* Estimated Population from US Bureau of Census

Source: Data from 618, Table C-13 at <https://www.ideadata.org/PopulationData.asp#2010>

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010-11:

While the estimated population decreased by 5.2%, the number of children birth to age 3 increased by 8.0% and Missouri met the target for 2010-11.

See the discussion for Indicator 5 for information about both the birth to 1 and birth to 3 groups.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010-11:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2009 (2009-10) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010-11

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Indicator 7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010-11	100.0% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs will have an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting conducted within Part C's 45-day timelines

Actual Target Data for 2010-11:

At 96.0%, Missouri did not meet the 100% target for this indicator.

45-Day Timeline Data (includes initial IFSPs developed throughout the entire fiscal year)

Initial IFSPs	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
# IFSPs with acceptable timelines*	2,388	1,478	1,336	47	72
Total IFSPs	2,510	1,551	1,406	47	75
% with acceptable timelines	95.1%	95.3%	95.0%	100.0%	96.0%

*"Acceptable timelines" includes those evaluations and initial IFSP meetings completed within the 45-day timeline as well as those that went over 45 days due to parent or child reasons. Both the IFSPs with acceptable timelines (numerator) and the total IFSPs (denominator) include children whose delays were due to exceptional family circumstances. See explanation below for more information.

Data reported for 2006-07 included all children in the State.

Data reported for 2007-08 and 2008-09 included all children in five of the ten SPOEs in the State.

Data reported for 2009-10 and 2010-11 are based on a review of selected files from five of the ten SPOEs in the State. (See Overview under "Monitoring Procedures" for selection procedures).

The following table provides detail on the reasons for exceeding the 45-day timeline. These reasons are required to be entered by Service Coordinators in the web system if a referral exceeds 45 days.

45-Day Timeline Calculation Details	Number
Initial IFSPs	75
Initial IFSPs under 45 days	64
Initial IFSPs over 45 days with acceptable reasons	8
Initial IFSPs over 45 days with unacceptable reasons	3
Total under 45 days or with acceptable reasons	72
Percent under 45 days or with acceptable reasons	96.0%

For the children listed above whose 45-day timeline was not met, the delays ranged from one to 51 days beyond the 45-day timeline. Acceptable reasons for the delays included family holiday/vacation, the inability to contact the family, and child illness/hospitalization. Unacceptable reasons for the three Service Coordinator delays included vacation and scheduling/follow-up with providers.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010-11:

The State did not meet the target of 100.0% compliance. While slippage from the previous year is reported, the State continues to report high performance for this indicator. The identified noncompliance was due to isolated events, thus no pattern was observed in not meeting the 45-day timeline.

Improvement Activities for 2010-11 included the following:

- Provide targeted technical assistance to SPOEs not in compliance with 45-day timeline requirements.
- Provide training and professional development to SPOEs in the area of 45-day timelines.

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Provide Targeted Technical Assistance: The State reported 100% compliance on this indicator in the previous APR and there was no targeted technical assistance to specific SPOE agencies.

Training and Professional Development: The lead agency conducts quarterly meetings with all ten SPOE agencies, which includes attendance by the SPOE Directors, lead Service Coordinators and Area Directors. During these meetings, the SPOE staff share challenges related to SPOE operations and ask questions regarding Department policies and procedures. In 2010-11, monthly targeted technical assistance was provided to the SPOEs related to formal and informal assessment procedures, screening, eligibility determination and transdisciplinary service delivery.

Throughout 2010-11, the Area Directors conducted provider trainings on the use of formal and informal evaluation measures as well as the 45-day timeline. Technical assistance and follow-up was given to providers on an as needed basis. Ongoing training and technical assistance to providers will continue in 2011-12.

In May 2011, the lead agency updated the Service Coordinator Practice Manual and posted the revised manual on the Department's website. The purpose of the revision was to encourage consistent practices between the ten SPOE regions. Ongoing technical assistance was provided, as needed, by the Area Directors throughout 2010-11.

In 2010-11, enhancements were made to the WebSPOE system that included a Provider Service Request form that promotes prompt communication between the Service Coordinator and the evaluator in order to inform the provider of an upcoming evaluation and the 45-day timeline. Also in 2010-11, the Area Directors conducted regional provider trainings regarding the use of the Routines-Based Interview as a child and family assessment. As part of this training, the providers received additional guidance on meeting the 45-day timeline.

Correction of previous noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance: As previously reported in the FFY09 APR, no findings of noncompliance were originally issued for this indicator in 2009-10 because prior to issuance of findings, State staff confirmed that all the children had had an initial IFSP meeting, although late. Per OSEP instructions in the FFY09 response table, "...the State must demonstrate in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the uncorrected noncompliance was verified as corrected consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02."

In response to OSEP's request, in the fall of 2011, the State did a desk review of updated data from each of the five SPOEs monitored for this indicator in 2009-10. Five files were randomly selected from each of the five SPOEs to verify that all noncompliance had been corrected at 100%. All files were found to be in compliance. As a result of the verification process, the State verified that these five SPOEs had corrected all noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance: As previously reported in the FFY08 APR, no findings of noncompliance were originally issued for this indicator in 2008-09 because prior to issuance of findings, State staff confirmed that all children had had an initial IFSP meeting, although late. Per OSEP instructions in the FFY09 response table, "...the State must demonstrate in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the uncorrected noncompliance was verified as corrected consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02."

In response to OSEP's request, in the fall of 2011, the State did a desk review of updated data from each of the five SPOEs monitored for this indicator in 2009-10. Five files were randomly selected from each of the five SPOEs to verify that all noncompliance had been corrected at 100%. All files were found to be in compliance. As a result of the verification process, the State verified that these five SPOEs had corrected all noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable)

N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010-11:

One Improvement Activity has been revised in the State Performance Plan to provide clarity regarding the intended audience for trainings and professional development. This change was presented to and approved by the SICC in January 2012.

MO FFY 2009 (2009-10) Response Table

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: For noncompliance the State attempted to verify as corrected prior to issuing findings, the State must demonstrate in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the uncorrected noncompliance was verified as corrected consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Department Response: The State has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled "Correction of Previous Noncompliance." The State was able to verify that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§303.321(e)(2), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a desk review of updated data; and (2) has conducted the initial evaluation, assessment, and IFSP meeting, although late, for any child for whom the 45-day timeline was not met, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010-11

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Indicator 8: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

- A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;
- B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and
- C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services)}}{\text{(\# of children exiting Part C)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred)}}{\text{(\# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred)}}{\text{(\# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010-11	100% of all children exiting Part C will receive timely transition planning by their third birthday

Actual Target Data for 2010-11:

The State met the 100% target for 8A, 8B and 8C.

8A: Children Exiting Part C who Received Timely Transition Planning	
A. Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	68
B. Number of children exiting Part C	68
Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday	100.0%

Trend data for 8A:

Year	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Percent in compliance (8A)	92.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The results for 8A were gathered by reviewing a randomly selected transition file for every Service Coordinator in each of the five SPOEs monitored. The number of files reviewed for each SPOE ranged in

number from five files in the smallest rural SPOE to 15 files in the largest urban SPOE monitored. The State met the target of 100% for 8A.

8B: Children Exiting Part C Where Notification to the LEA Occurred					
	Number of files reviewed	Number of parents who opted out	Number of parents providing consent	Number of LEAs notified	Percent in compliance 2010-11
B: Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B	68	2	66	66	100.0%

Trend data for 8B:

Year	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Percent in compliance (8B)	90.9%	94.7%	98.6%	100.0%	100.0%

The results for 8B were gathered from file reviews of the same children referred to in 8A, who exited the program during 2010-11, and reflects the number of children for whom the LEA was provided with directory information. The State met the target of 100% for 8B.

With OSEP approval, and after training all SPOE agencies, Missouri implemented an “opt out” policy in July 2009. A change in State regulations, accomplished June 30, 2010, brought Missouri into compliance with federal requirements requiring notification of the LEA with directory information of First Steps children potentially eligible for Part B services unless a parent “opted out” of providing that information, in writing. First Steps “opt out” policy can be found on pages 11-12 at:

http://dese.mo.gov/schoollaw/rulesregs/Inc_By_Ref_Mat/IDEAPartB.htm.

8C: Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B	Number of Children
Number of children exiting Part C	68
Number of late referrals*	2
Number in compliance with 90 day timeline	65
Number in compliance but delay due to exceptional family circumstances	1
Total in compliance	66
Number out of compliance	0
Percent in compliance 2010-11	100%

*One child referred between 135 and 90 days before third birthday and one child referred less than 90 days before third birthday. In both cases the transition meetings were held in conjunction with the initial IFSP meeting. These are excluded from the calculation.

Data reported for 2009-10 and 2010-11 are based on a review of selected files from five of the ten SPOEs in the State. (See Overview under “Monitoring Procedures” for selection procedures).

The chart above shows the number of children (68) reviewed for 8C. Sixty-five children were found to be in compliance with transition timelines. One child referred 139 days before third birthday and parent delayed the initial/transition meeting due to the holidays and child illness. This exceptional family circumstance has been included in the numerator and denominator of the calculation for indicator 8C.

Trend data for 8C:

Year	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Percent in compliance (8C)	78.1%	94.2%	92.6%	91.2%	100.0%

The results for 8C were gathered through the review of files from the same five SPOEs as reviewed for 8A and 8B. These files were of children transitioning from Part C to Part B from July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011. The State met the target of 100% for 8C.

Per OSEP instructions, the State is currently in the process of revising the Part C State regulations to document the transition timeline as: “At approximately six months, but not less than 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months prior to the child’s third birth date, the Part C Service Coordinator will convene an IFSP meeting to discuss the transition steps with the parents and other IFSP team members in order to develop a transition plan.” The numbers in the chart above reflect this change.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010-11:

Missouri improved performance from 91.2% in 2009-10 to 100% compliance with this indicator in 2010-11. This progress is due to the State revising its transition meeting timeline.

Improvement Activities for 2010-11 included the following:

- Provide training and professional development to all SPOE agencies to improve collaboration and coordination with families and school districts in the area of C to B Transition timelines.
- Provide information on strategies for improving performance on this indicator.

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Training and Professional Development: The lead agency maintains a webpage specifically for Transition C to B topics in order to organize all transition training materials and technical assistance documents in one place. This page can be viewed at:

<http://dese.mo.gov/se/fs/Transitionindexpg.htm>. Additionally, a webinar was held in January 2011 with First Steps and ECSE personnel attending. The purpose of the webinar was to clarify the transition timelines and encourage collaboration and communication between First Steps and ECSE. Statewide Transition C to B trainings have been conducted in the spring of every other year. This schedule was initiated in the spring of 2006, repeated in 2008 and again in 2010. Transition training(s) are being developed with the plan to disseminate in Spring 2012.

In 2010-11, Listserv messages on collaboration between Parts C and B were disseminated to the field throughout the year. In several areas of the State, regional interagency meetings have included topics of discussion related to successful transition from Part C to Part B. Ongoing technical assistance by the Area Directors is available to SPOE Directors and Service Coordinators as needed.

The lead agency participates in state and regional partnership meetings where First Steps and ECSE personnel discuss ways to improve collaboration and communication between the two programs in order to facilitate successful transitions for families from First Steps to ECSE. Participation in these meetings will continue in 2011-12.

Strategies for Improving Performance: During 2010-11, the lead agency prepared a family information packet on Part C to Part B transition. This packet includes a DVD depicting the transition meeting and participation by early childhood programs at the local school district and community programs such as Head Start. The packet also includes a parent handbook covering basic information on the transition process.

Correction of Previous Noncompliance

Indicator 8A

Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable): 8A: N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2009.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance: 8A: N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2008.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable): 8A: N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

Indicator 8B

Correction of Remaining FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable): 8B: No findings of noncompliance were issued for this indicator in 2009-10 because all SPOEs monitored were at 100%.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance: 8B: N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2008.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable): 8B: N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

Indicator 8C

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance: 8C: As previously reported in the FFY09 APR, no findings of noncompliance were originally issued for this indicator in 2009-10 because the extent of noncompliance did not meet the State's former criteria for identification of systemic noncompliance and individual correction was not required because the children had already exited the Part C system. Per OSEP instructions in the FFY09 response table, "... the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator."

In response to OSEP's request, in the fall of 2011, the State did a desk review of updated data from each of the five SPOEs monitored for this indicator in 2009-10. Five files were randomly selected from each of the five SPOEs to verify that all noncompliance had been corrected at 100%. All files were found to be in compliance. As a result of the verification process, the State confirmed that these five SPOEs had corrected all noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance: 8C: As previously reported in the FFY08 APR, no findings of noncompliance were originally issued for this indicator in 2008-09 because the extent of noncompliance did not meet the State's former criteria for identification of systemic noncompliance and individual correction was not required because the children had already exited the Part C system. Per OSEP instructions in the FFY09 response table, "... the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator."

In response to OSEP's request, in the fall of 2011, the State did a desk review of updated data from each of the five SPOEs monitored for this indicator in 2008-09. Five files were randomly selected from each of the five SPOEs to verify that all noncompliance had been corrected at 100%. During the desk review, continued noncompliance was identified in one of the five SPOEs with one instance of noncompliance. Two additional files were reviewed for this instance of noncompliance resulting in 100% correction. The file with identified noncompliance was for a child who was no longer in the First Steps program; therefore, no individual child corrective action was issued. As a result of the verification process, the State confirmed that these five SPOEs had corrected all noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable): 8C: N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010-11:

One Improvement Activity has been revised and one has been discontinued in the State Performance Plan. These changes were made as a result of an evaluation process that identified duplicative efforts within multiple Improvement Activities. This change was presented to and approved by the SICC in January 2012.

MO FFY 2009 (2009-10) Response Table**OSEP Analysis/Next Steps Indicator 8A:**

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps Indicator 8B:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps Indicator 8C: The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the State is in compliance with the timely transition conference requirements in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has conducted a transition conference, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose transition conference was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.

Department Response Indicator 8C: The State has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled “Correction of Previous Noncompliance.” The State was able to verify that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)) based on a desk review of updated data; and (2) has conducted a transition conference, although late, for any child potentially eligible for Part B whose transition conference was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010-11

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 9: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010-11	100% of noncompliance will be corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification

Actual Target Data for 2010-11:

Missouri had 100% correction of noncompliance identified in 2009-10. Missouri requires 100% correction of identified noncompliance in all initial monitoring reviews, as well as in any follow-up files submitted for review.

SPOEs are monitored for SPP compliance indicators as well as additional State standards and indicators. The correction of noncompliance from findings issued in 2009-10 is reported in the following table. The columns of the table are as follows:

- (a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in 2009-10 – the total number of individual instances of noncompliance identified
- (b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification – the total number of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year from the date of the final reports

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 through 6/30/10)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 through 6/30/10)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	NA
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	NA
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	NA
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved outcomes	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	NA
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	NA
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	NA
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and	Monitoring Activities:	4	11	11

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of EIS Programs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 through 6/30/10)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 through 6/30/10)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;	Monitoring Activities:	2	2	2
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	NA
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	NA
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	NA
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			13	13
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.			(b) / (a) X 100 =	100.0%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010-11:

The State met the target of 100% for this indicator.

Improvement Activities for 2010-11 included the following:

- Provide training and professional development through Area Directors to SPOEs/ providers for development and implementation of corrective action plans.
- Manage/support a comprehensive general supervision system to ensure timely correction of noncompliance.

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Training and Professional Development: The lead agency employs First Steps Area Directors to assist SPOEs with specific issues identified through compliance monitoring reviews, which includes assistance in developing and implementing corrective action plans. Training and/or individual technical assistance is provided in each SPOE region, as needed, to ensure that SPOE staff are informed about and operating under compliant procedures.

General Supervision System: The lead agency supports two systems which help to ensure timely correction of noncompliance. The IMACS for Part C is a database that includes compliance file reviews and corrective action plans. Missouri's WebSPOE system was implemented September 1, 2005 with an enhancement released February 24, 2011. The system contains all elements of referral, intake, eligibility determination, and IFSP development and implementation for all children referred to First Steps. The system is compliance-driven and ensures compliance with regulations as well as best practice, which makes the WebSPOE system an integral part of Missouri's general supervision system.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010-11:

One Improvement Activity has been revised in the State Performance Plan to provide clarity regarding the intended audience for trainings and professional development. This change was presented to and approved by the SICC in January 2012.

Correction of previous noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2009 Findings of Noncompliance: As previously reported in the FFY09 APR, the State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%; however, the results reported were based on the State's former criteria for correction of noncompliance. The State's criteria for correction of noncompliance have since been updated and are consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 (see "Monitoring Procedures" in Overview). Per OSEP instructions in the FFY09 response table, "the State must report that it verified that each EIS program with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction."

In response to OSEP's request, in the fall of 2011, the State did a desk review of updated data from each of the five SPOEs monitored in 2009-10 to verify that all noncompliance had been corrected at 100%. For each item of noncompliance, five files were randomly selected from each of the five SPOEs to verify that noncompliance had been corrected at 100%. During the desk review, continued noncompliance was identified. Two additional files for each instance of noncompliance were reviewed resulting in 100% correction. All findings of individual child noncompliance were corrected within 60 days of the identification for the children still participating in the First Steps program. As a result of the verification

process, the State confirmed that these five SPOEs had corrected all noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

MO FFY 2009 (2009-10) Response Table

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must report that it verified that each EIS program with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

In reporting on Indicator 9 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 9 Worksheet.

In addition, in responding to Indicators 1 and 8C in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.

Department Response: The State has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled “Correction of Previous Noncompliance.” The State was able to verify that each EIS program with noncompliance reflected in the table for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a desk review of updated data; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

The State used the Indicator 9 Worksheet as indicated above.

The State reported on correction of noncompliance for indicators 1, 7, and 8C as described under those indicators in the APR.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010-11

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 10: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010-11	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances

Actual Target Data for 2010-11:

During 2010-11, one child complaint was filed, and the report was issued within timelines, resulting in 100% compliance with this indicator.

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Complaints with reports issued	3	6	0	1	1
Reports within timelines	3	6	0	1	1
Reports within extended timelines	0	0	0	0	0
Percent issued within 60 day or extended timelines	100.0%	100.0%	NA	100.0%	100.0%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010-11:

The State continues to maintain 100% compliance with this indicator.

Improvement Activities for 2010-11 included the following:

- Manage current program to maintain compliance with 60 day timeline for resolution of child complaints.
- Provide online training of complaint system for stakeholders.

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Manage Current Program: The Department continues to use a database to record and monitor the timelines for issuance of child complaints. Reports are monitored to ensure that reports are issued within 60 days or, if not possible due to the nature of the complaint, appropriate extensions are made.

Online Training: In September 2007, the Office of Special Education staff completed a web-based video to assist parents, districts, advocates, and others on the procedures of the complaint system which includes a description of the timelines of the complaint system for child complaints. In spring 2010, the video was shown during a meeting between Department staff and staff of Missouri Protection and Advocacy. The training is reviewed annually to determine if there is a need for revision.

Additionally, the State, in conjunction with the University of Missouri, is developing a comprehensive online Special Education training called SPED 101. The purpose of this training is to provide on-line information to stakeholders regarding the special education process, as implemented in Missouri and in accordance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010-11:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2009 (2009-10) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010-11

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 11: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010-11	100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline

Actual Target Data for 2010-11:

No due process hearing requests were filed during 2010-11.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010-11:

No explanation of progress/slippage can be made, as no due process hearing requests were filed during 2010-11.

Improvement Activities for 2010-11 included the following:

- Manage current program to maintain compliance with applicable timelines for resolution of due process hearing requests.
- Provide online training of complaint system for stakeholders.

Discussion of the Improvement Activities follows:

Manage Current Program: The Department continues to use a database to record and monitor the timelines for issuance of child complaints. Reports are monitored to ensure that reports are issued within 60 days or, if not possible due to the nature of the complaint, appropriate extensions are made.

Online Training: In September 2007, the Office of Special Education staff completed a web-based video to assist parents, districts, advocates, and others on the procedures of the complaint system which includes a description of the timelines of the complaint system for child complaints. In spring 2010, the video was shown during a meeting between Department staff and staff of Missouri Protection and Advocacy. The training is reviewed annually to determine if there is a need for revision.

Additionally, the State, in conjunction with the University of Missouri, is developing a comprehensive online Special Education training called SPED 101. The purpose of this training is to provide on-line information to stakeholders regarding the special education process, as implemented in Missouri and in accordance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010-11:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2009 (2009-10) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010-11

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 12: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010-11	Missouri did not adopt Part B due process procedures for Part C

Actual Target Data for 2010-11:

Not applicable as Missouri did not adopt Part B due process procedures for Part C.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010-11:

Not applicable

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010-11:

Not applicable

MO FFY 2009 (2009-10) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010-11

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 13: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010-11	Not set due to lack of baseline data

Actual Target Data for 2010-11:

There were no mediation requests during 2010-11.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010-11:

Not applicable

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010-11:

No revisions were made in the State Performance Plan. Per OSEP, the State is not required to provide targets or Improvement Activities except in any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

MO FFY 2009 (2009-10) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a State response on this indicator.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2010-11

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count and settings and November 1 for exiting and dispute resolution); and
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010-11	100% of State reported data will be timely and accurate

Actual Target Data for 2010-11:

The State met the 100% target for this indicator.

Missouri utilizes a variety of data sources to compile data for the Annual Performance Report and the Section 618 data. Sources include the following:

- WebSPOE system - WebSPOE is a web-based system used to maintain child level data for the First Steps program. These data are used for the Section 618 child count, primary setting and exit reporting. WebSPOE is also used for APR Indicators 2, 3, 5, 6
- Monitoring – data gathered through monitoring reviews are utilized for Indicators 1, 7, 8 and 9
- Dispute Resolution Database – the database is used to record information on child complaints, due process hearing requests, mediations and resolution sessions. The database is used to monitor timelines throughout the year, and data are used for the Section 618 Dispute Resolution table and for APR Indicators 10-13
- Survey – The First Steps family survey is sent annually to all active families and includes a variety of questions related to family experience in the program. The family survey is used for APR Indicator 4.

Missouri utilized OSEP's scoring rubric to evaluate the accuracy and timeliness of data collected for 2010-11. The results follow:

Indicator 14 - SPP/APR Data			
APR Indicator	Valid and reliable	Correct calculation	Total
1	1	1	2
2	1	1	2
3	1	1	2
4	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
6	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8A	1	1	2
8B	1	1	2
8C	1	1	2
9	1	1	2
10	1	1	2
11	1	1	2
12	1	1	2
13	1	1	2
		Subtotal	30
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points – If the FFY 2010 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right		5
	Grand Total		35

Indicator 14 - 618 Data					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Table 1 – Child Count Due Date: 2/2/11	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 – Settings Due Date: 2/2/11	1	1	1	1	4
Table 3 – Exiting Due Date: 11/2/11	1	1	1	NA	3
Table 4 – Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/11	1	1	1	N/A	3
				Subtotal	14
			Grand Total (Subtotal X 2.5)		35

Indicator #14 Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	35.00
B. 618 Grand Total	35.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	70.00
Total NA in APR	0
Total NA in 618	0
Base	70.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base) =	1.000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.0%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2010-11:

Missouri continues to meet the target of 100% for timely and accurate State reported data. All 618 data and required reports have been submitted on or before the due dates. OSEP data reports, as well as data submitted in the SPP/APR are accurate as evidenced by the verification efforts described below.

Improvement Activities for 2010-11 included the following:

- Support the development and implementation of the Missouri Student Information System (MOSIS) and the WebSPOE data system.
- Provide information to Area Directors and SPOE Directors regarding data collection and reporting for IDEA.

Discussion of these Improvement Activities follows:

Data Systems: Missouri implemented the WebSPOE system on September 1, 2005 with an enhancement released February 24, 2011. This system captures data elements in the Part C system and contains information from referral, intake, eligibility determination and IFSP development and implementation. The WebSPOE system is compliance-driven; it requires critical data items and conducts edit checks on data to help ensure accuracy. The system supplies data that can be reviewed at the SPOE and State levels for program evaluation and monitoring purposes. Much of the data for the SPP/APR comes from this system, and various data elements are verified as necessary.

For grades PK-12, the Department has fully implemented the MOSIS, a student-level data collection system. Staff who work with special education data are part of a Department workgroup that identified and defined the necessary data elements. The Department has worked to ensure that definitions and interpretations of data elements are accurate and consistent across programs. Extensive technical assistance to districts ensures smooth implementation and accuracy of data. A key element of MOSIS is a unique identifier for each student, called the MOSIS ID. A MOSIS ID is also obtained for every child in the First Steps program so that data can be linked from the First Steps system to the Missouri PK-12 public school system.

Data Reports: In 2010-11, the State provided monthly SPOE data reports of key indicators related to primary referral sources, eligibility rates, active child count and inactivation reasons. These reports are available to the public at: <http://dese.mo.gov/se/fs/data.html>. These reports are reviewed on a monthly basis by the Area Directors and the SPOE Directors to ensure accurate data collection and reporting. Monthly reports are analyzed by the Area Directors on a quarterly basis and technical assistance is provided to the SPOE on an as needed basis.

In January of each year, the State publically reports the results of the SPP indicators. The regional report of SPP performance is available at: <http://dese.mo.gov/se/SPPpage.html>. These results are reviewed with the SPOE Directors to verify accurate data.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2010-11:

No revisions have been made in the State Performance Plan.

MO FFY 2009 (2009-10) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: In reporting on Indicator 14 in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must use the Indicator 14 Data Rubric.

Department Response: The State used the Indicator 14 Data Rubric to provide the data for this indicator. The rubric is replicated in this document.